UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,285	06/30/2008	Subhra S. Bose	003433.00096	3316

22907 7590 02/15/2011

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.
1100 13th STREET, N.W.
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-4051

EXAMINER	
HUARACHA, WILLY W	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2196	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/15/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/560,285	BOSE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Willy W. Huaracha	2196	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *14 December 2010*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26-54* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *26-54* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/12/2010*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 26-54 are currently pending and have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 26-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kreger "Web Service conceptual Architecture" in view of Cole et al. (US Pub. No. 20030090514 A1).

4. Kreger and Cole were cited in a previous office action.

5. As per claim 26, Kreger teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a method, comprising:

executing, by a computing device, business logic expressed in one or more declarative languages, the business logic including a process description, the process description defining one or more flows, one or more rules, and one or more states (Abstract; page 6, lines 5-11; page 33; page 11, lines 14-23; fig. 2),

wherein each of the one or more flows represents a control flow between business functions (page 12, lines 25-33),

Kreger does not appear to expressly define rules and states in the description; wherein each of the one or more states represents a legal state transition for at least one business entity,

and wherein each of the one or more rules represents a business rule or policy enforced on the at least one business entity in an externalized form. However, Cole teaches a method for controlling business process by applying rules, states, and flows (par. 0015 lines 1-24); wherein each of the one or more states represents a legal state transition for at least one business entity (par. 0112; 0115), and wherein each of the one or more rules represents a business rule or policy enforced on the at least one business entity in an externalized form (par. 0073-0074).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated, to the system of Kreger, the method of controlling business processes using rules, states and flows as outlined by Cole for the purpose of providing the capability to adapt business processes by scenario and/or context and in real time (abstract).

6. As per claim 27, Cole teaches wherein a business process described by the process description includes one or more tasks, wherein at least one of the one or more tasks is selected from a library of tasks in which each task has a precondition and a postcondition, and wherein the desired precondition and postcondition are automatically determined prior to execution (par. 0098-0092).

7. As per claim 28, Cole teaches wherein the one or more flows, the one or more states, and the one or more rules are coordinated by a controller software module (par. 0066, system context layer).

8. As per claim 29, Cole and Kreger do not expressly teach wherein the business logic is

executed by a plurality of parties, wherein at least one party of the plurality of parties acts as a trusted party for at least one other party in the plurality of parties, and wherein the trusted party guarantees correctness of a protocol at design time and at run time, maintains records of all interactions, and performs some activities for the at least one other party during the execution of the business logic However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have expanded the teaching of Kreger and Cole by providing a mechanism that allows for a participant to perform verification for other participants, at design/runtime so as to ensure correctness of a business process. .

9. As per claim 30, Kreger teaches wherein at least one of the one or more declarative languages is XML (page 6, Web Services, lines 5-11).

10. As per claim 31, Kreger teaches wherein at least one of the one or more declarative languages is WSDL (page 6, Web Services, lines 5-11).

11. As per claim 32, Cole teaches wherein one or more assertions are associated with a business process described by the process description, and wherein the one or more assertions describe one or more preconditions or one or more postconditions at one or more points in the business process (par.0089-0102).

12. As per claim 33, Cole teaches wherein the one or more assertions are checked at runtime to ensure that the executing of the business logic is correct (par. 0092).

13. As per claim 34, Cole wherein the one or more assertions which describe the one or more preconditions are used to check the correctness of the business logic prior to the executing of the business logic (par. 0090-0092).

14. As per claim 35, Cole teaches wherein the one or more assertions which describe the one or more postconditions are used to check the correctness of the business logic subsequent to the executing of the business logic (par. 0090-0092).

15. As per claim 36, Cole teaches wherein each of the one or more rules influences the control flow and cause one or more state transitions (par. 0090).

16. As per claim 37, Kreger teaches wherein the business logic is executed via a web-based transport protocol (page 6, Web Services, lines 5-11).

17. As per claim 38, Kreger teaches wherein the web-based transport protocol is HTTP (page 6, Web Services, lines 5-11).

18. As per claim 39, Kreger teaches wherein the web-based transport protocol is HTTPS (page 6, Web Services, lines 5-11).

19. As per claim 40-53, are directed to one or more non-transitory computer-readable media

having similar limitations as claims 26-39. Thus, claims 40-53 are rejected for the same rationale as applied to claims 26-39.

20. As per claim 54, it is a system having similar limitations as claim 26. Thus, claim 54 is rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 26.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments filed 12/14/2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant argues in page that the combination of Kreger and Cole does not teach a business logic expressed in one or more declarative languages.

(1) The examiner respectfully submits that Kreger teaches business logic expressed in declarative languages such as XML, HTTP including process description (Abstract; page 6, lines 5-11; page 33; page 11, lines 14-23; fig. 2). Additionally, Cole also teaches business logic defined in XML (par. 0064) including rules, flows and states (par. 0015 lines 1-24; par. 0112; 0115; par. 0073-0074).

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. U.S. Pub. No. 20030187743 A1

b. U.S. Pub. No. 20050138132 A1

c. Thorpe "Business Rule Exchange-the Next XML Wave"

Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to WILLY W HUARACHA whose telephone number is (571) 270-5510. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am to 6:00pm, EST.

24. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Emerson Puente can be reached on (571) 272-3652. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

25. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Emerson C Puente/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2196	/Willy W. Huaracha/ Examiner, Art Unit 2196